10c. A COPY $1 A YEAR

MOTHER EARTH

Monthly Magazine Devoted to Social Science and Literature

Published Every 15th of the Month

EMMA GOLDMAN, Proprietor, 210 East Thirteenth Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter April 9, 1906, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Vol. II FEBRUARY, 1908 No. 12

TO OUR READERS.

This issue completes the second year of the magazine. We urgently request our subscribers to send in their renewal at once, as—according to the latest ruling of the Post Office Department—we cannot carry any unpaid subscribers.

We wish to inform our friends that we have but a very limited number of copies of the first volume of MOTHER EARTH. In fact, there are but twelve sets on hand, handsomely bound, at $2.00 per volume. Those wishing to secure a copy will please order at once.

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Washington, D. C., is the bulwark of our liberties. A public meeting, which comrade Emma Goldman was announced to address, was recently interdicted by the police. The manner in which it was done was outrageous and cowardly in the extreme. At first Major Sylvester, Chief of the Washington police, flatly refused to allow Emma Goldman to lecture in Washington. When his attention was called to the fact that he had absolutely no right to deprive anyone of free speech, he hypocritically consented to permit the lecture; later, however, he informed the arrangement committee that the meeting could not take place, on the alleged ground that the proprietor of the hall had not complied with certain fire regulations. The license of the hall was declared cancelled, but a "temporary license" was issued to the manager, permitting him to allow "such entertainments and meetings which are not objectionable to the district authorities,"—a police trick, which made our meeting impossible.

The big stick policy is evidently supreme in Washington. But do the authorities really believe that they can stop our propaganda by such cowardly methods?

* * *

The Federal Supreme Court is determined to teach labor a much-needed lesson as to the value of alleged labor legislation.

Three important decisions, far-reaching in their effects, have recently been handed down by the Supreme Court. The Employers' Liability act has been declared unconstitutional. A similar blow was delivered to the Erdman act by declaring that a corporation may discharge an employee without naming any ground other than that the employee was a member of a labor organization. The latest decision is with regard to boycotts; it declares that hereafter any union which undertakes a boycott renders every one of its members personally liable for threefold damages to the firm or individual boycotted.

Will these lessons suffice to enlighten labor on the subject of "improving conditions by legislation"? Will they continue wasting their hard-earned money by lobbying and political wire-pulling? These decisions of the

court are to be welcomed as proof that the laws are solely for the protection of the exploiters. When the workers learn this lesson they will realize that politics are a snare and a delusion, and that labor's battles are to be fought exclusively on the economic field. Intelligent direct action and the General Strike are the true emancipators of labor.

* * *

The President has surprised the country by informing it, in his last message to Congress, that "the movement in which we are engaged is fundamentally an ethical one." We learn further that the purpose of this "movement" is "to secure National honesty in business and in politics." This purpose of securing honesty is to be achieved by—legislation.

Roosevelt makes a strong effort to draw the line of demarcation between "predatory" wealth and honest business. But it would require a greater genius than the President to find any real difference between them. There may be legitimate and illegitimate business; but whether approved by the law or not, all forms of profit-making are based on exploitation, and no "movement" whose purpose it is to uphold and perpetuate profit-making can be an ethical one. Profit-making, whether industrial, commercial, or rental, is not a whit more "ethical" than any other form of theft. True, the law permits and defends certain forms of robbery. But since when is law synonymous with ethics?

The President is fighting windmills. There can no more be "honest business" than "clean politics." The one is based on theft; the other on corruption and violence. If the "movement" of the President were really for the purpose of "securing National honesty in business and politics," his object could be accomplished only by abolishing the bulwarks of business and politics, i. e., government, which legalizes exploitation.

The real purpose of the Roosevelt "movement" becomes apparent, however, when the President reaches the subject of injunctions. "I should consider it most unwise to abolish the use of the process of injunction. It is necessary in order that the courts may maintain their own dignity and in order that they may in effective manner check disorder and violence."

The "dignity of the courts" consists in their faithful service of capitalism. In the latter's vocabulary disorder and violence mean the attempt on the part of the disinterested to regain some part of their stolen product. Such attempts, Roosevelt thinks, must be checked in an effective manner. And there is no better way of accomplishing it than by the process of injunction.

The hypocrisy of the President is disgusting, considering his show of alleged sympathy with the aspirations of labor. Conceding the latter's right to organize for the protection of its interests, Roosevelt in the same breath champions the process of injunction, the basest weapon yet designed by capitalism to nullify the very purpose of trade unions.

The intelligent workingman who carefully reads the President's sentiments with regard to labor and injunctions cannot fail to realize that Roosevelt is a loyal champion of capitalism, and as such, a foe to the best interests of labor.

* * *

To what extent our false civilization, based on the Christian morality of meekness, has succeeded in eradicating man's natural spirit of independence and self-assertion, is best proved by the present crisis.

All over the land thousands of workmen are unemployed. What little savings they may have had, have been swallowed by the banks or have been used up in the first few weeks of the crisis. Now the wolf is at the door, and the rigors of winter are still further adding to the widespread privation and misery. Women and little children are suffering for the very necessaries of life, and the men are hopeless and despondent.

In vain are their efforts to find work; in vain even to beg charity. All resources are apparently exhausted. In vague, dumb hope the destitute masses look up to the political parties—not a ray of encouragement, not a sign of sympathy there with all this undeserved suffering of the creators of our wealth. Despairing, some turn to the mayors and city fathers for help; they beg, they entreat: "We need bread; our wives are starving; our babes are crying for food; we ask only for work. See, our arms are strong, our hands are willing; only give us work that we may live."

But the cries of the hungry fall on deaf ears. The mayors, the politicians know no crisis; the times are never hard for them. And wherever the unemployed turn they are told to wait, to be patient, or to vote next November the "right" ticket—but nowhere any help, nowhere any aid.

"Ask and it shall be given you." Nazarene, thou wert a false phophet. Rather shouldst have taught, "Take and you shall have." The meek and lowly shall inherit nothing but starvation; only the self-reliant and independent shall have the kingdom of heaven, which is on earth.

* * *

On the occasion of the recent Haywood meeting at Grand Central Palace, some members of the Socialist arrangement committee attempted to prevent our comrades from distributing the leaflet "To the Unemployed and Homeless," issued by the Anarchist Federation. When persuasion and threats proved futile, the Socialists called the police, insisting especially on the arrest of a young lady who was very active in distributing the leaflets. The police did not appear anxious to make arrests, but the Socialists insisted till finally the hand of the law forced some of our comrades to leave the hall.

This is not a solitary example. Such incidents have been but too frequent. The question arises: If the Socialists are so intolerant *now* towards those of different views, what would happen to undesirable citizens if the Socialists were in power?

* * *

The country will be relieved to know that the courts are at last through washing the dirty linen of the Thaw family. A jury of his peers has found Harry Thaw innocent, on the ground of paranoia. All the evidence in the case was to the effect that Harry Thaw is a criminal idiot. But if Harry Thaw is an idiot, and the gentlemen of the jury are his peers, then . . .

The Thaw family spent a fortune to prove that their "young hopeful" is a degenerate, whose proper place is in the insane asylum. Naturally, the man who would "defend" the "honor" of an Evelyn must be insane. But if Harry Thaw were a poor man's son, he would now be in the electric chair.

We do not believe in punishment: 'tis but barbaric

revenge, never beneficial, but always reacting to the injury of both, the punisher and punished. Nor are we naïve enough to believe that Harry Thaw will be kept in the insane asylum. By the help of his millions he will speedily be declared sane. That Thaw is an insane degenerate is true; but his particular form of insanity is not paranoia, but dementia parasitica, the disease afflicting the whole class of social drones, whose worthy representative is Harry K. Thaw. The taxpayers of New York have paid thousands of dollars to learn that Harry Thaw is insane. The information were well worth the price if the people would have the good sense to send all those suffering, like Harry Thaw, from social parasitism, to join him at Matteawan—and to keep them there.

* * *

At no time in all Roman history was the contrast between patrician and plebeian so accentuated as is the case in modern society.

While the groans of misery and hunger rise from every city and hamlet, our plutocrats celebrate in the most consciously-provoking manner Lucullan feasts.

It were difficult to conceive a more heartlessly brutal spectacle than the recent Vanderbilt wedding. What wonder the toilers are starving: the wealth they have accumulated is being used to purchase "noble" husbands for the daughters of our millionaires. The latter fully realize, however, that it is dangerous to tempt the disinherited by the show of their stolen millions: detectives are engaged to guard the wedding gifts representing a million dollars of human tears and blood. The inhumanity of the spectacle was surpassed only by its vulgarity: the "sacred" ceremony was repeatedly rehearsed, as is customary with trained-dog performances in a circus.

Every feeling of humanity is outraged at such depravity and brutality; every decent heart burns with indignation at such spectacles, and hopes that the lightning may strike.

* * *

It is in the nature of the powers that be to grow more arrogant in proportion as they wax fat on the toil and suffering of the masses. The latter exist but to minister to the wants of their lords and masters. Popular rights and liberties are the mere playthings of the royal will. Parliaments are to be dissolved, constitutions abrogated

when they prove an obstacle to imperial whims; the "common rabble" are to be fed to cannons when they dare to lift their heads; prisons and scaffolds for the disturbers of the autocrat's peace.

But the clouds begin to gather and the rumblings of approaching storm are heard. Yet the mighty continue feasting, and ever wilder grow the bacchanalian orgies of despotic oppression. And all the time the clouds grow blacker and the thunders of popular discontent are swelling. "Shoot the canaille," cry the masters; "order must be preserved at all costs," and the timid cry for bread is drowned by the soldier's rifle.

But patience ceases to be a virtue, and suddenly the clouds burst. "King Carlos has been assassinated!"

Glad tidings! Go, circle the earth and make all tyrants tremble. The fate of Carlos will trace for them "events that cast their shadows before." Nemesis still lives! There is hope for a people that can fight its way to liberty.

* * *

President Roosevelt considered it necessary to send the following cable to the new King of Portugal:

"I hasten to express to you and to your bereaved Queen mother my heartfelt condolence by reason of the tragic death of your royal father and brother. The American people feel a peculiar bond of sympathy with the royal family and the people of Portugal in their great affliction, and they have been inexpressibly shocked and grieved at the dreadful tragedy. THEODORE ROOSEVELT."

Shades of Jefferson! Since when do "the American people feel a peculiar bond of sympathy" with royal families? Has Roosevelt consulted the people and learned that "they have been inexpressibly shocked and grieved at the dreadful tragedy"?

The impudence of the President is unheard of. Every self-respecting American, who prizes the revolutionary traditions of his country, must blush with shame at this instance of presidential toadying to royalty. Has Roosevelt ever sent condolences to the families of murdered American strikers? Surely the loss of a producer is a greater calamity than the death of a royal parasite.

* * *

The Senate passed, without debate, a resolution offered by Senator Cullom, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, "sincerely deploring the death by

unlawful and inhuman violence" of the King and Crown Prince of Portugal.

The honorable gentlemen of the Senate deplore the King's death "by unlawful violence." Of course, it is a different thing when starving workmen are shot down by capitalist hirelings. That's "lawful violence." One must be careful to distinguish the two kinds. As Shakespeare said with regard to our Senators, "they are all honorable men."

But while the Senators of "the freeest country on earth" were shedding copious tears over the grave of the Portuguese Butcher, the Hungarian Chamber of Deputies refused to vote a motion condoling with the royal family of Portugal in the death of King Carlos, and the majority in the Chamber voted for a substitute, as follows:

"The views of the Hungarian Parliament on freedom are such that the House could not dedicate a posthumous resolution to a King who had abolished constitutional government and instituted a dictatorship."

* * *

The Polish question in Prussia is daily becoming more acute. In the attempt to Teutonize its subjects, the Prussian government has carried its systematic persecution of the Poles to the extreme. The policy of Prussianizing has included the martyrdom of Polish children in German schools, the prohibition of the use of the Polish tongue in public meetings, and the practical deprivation of the Poles of all their civil rights. Unfortunately—to the shame of the once proud race, be it said—the Prussian Poles remained passive, "good and peaceable" subjects. Encouraged by this pusilanimity and cowardly submissiveness of the Poles, the Prussian government is now planning their compulsory dispossession, which means the practical rooting out of the Poles from the soil which has been their native country for hundreds of generations.

The contemplated governmental outrage has at last awakened the Poles to an active realization of their peril. Henryk Sienkiewicz, the well-known author, has issued an appeal, calling the attention of the world to the tyranny of the Prussian government, and urging upon the conscience of civilized humanity to voice its protest

against the terrible oppression of the Prussian Poles.

In reply to the appeal of Henryk Sienkiewicz, Count Tolstoy writes in part as follows:

"I am acquainted with the matter to which you refer, which has not surprised me, or even excited my indignation. It has merely confirmed my conviction of this absolute truth—paradoxical as it may appear to people hypnotized by the idée fixe of the State—that the time for oppressive governments is past, and that in our epoch it is only men completely devoid of all moral sense who can be rulers, emperors, kings, generals, or influential members of Parliament. Those men only occupy their positions in consequence of their moral decadence. In reality people who are engaged in despoiling the laboring masses in the form of taxation, in preparing and effecting massacres, in condemning men to death, and in constantly lying to themselves and to others, can have no morality. The pagan world had one virtuous emperor, Marcus Aurelius. In our Christian world, however, even the sovereigns of past centuries—all the French Louis and Napoleons, all our Catherine II.'s and Nicholas I.'s, all the German and English Fredericks, Henrys, and Elizabeths—whatever their flatterers may say, can excite no feeling but disgust. The sovereigns now living, instigators of violence and massacres of all kinds, are so far below the moral standard of the majority that they cannot even inspire disgust. They are but unfortunates, who deserve to be pitied. We should neither allow our indignation to rise against these creatures, who are void of the most sacred feeling of humanity, nor should we combat them. What we must fight against is the terrible and superannuated institution, the machinery of government, which is the principal source of all human distress."

Tolstoy is right in his claim that government, as an institution, is the source of all human distress, all misery, and oppression. The Polish question will be solved only with the solution of the social question, with the abolition of all government and authority. But such questions are not solved by "pitying the unfortunates, the rulers and emperors." You do not pity the wild tiger clutching your throat in a struggle of life and death. Oppression must be resisted. Only they deserve liberty who are willing to fight for it.

* * *

We call the attention of our readers to the just published new edition of Peter Kropotkin's work on "Modern Science and Anarchism." It is a book well worth careful study. The scientific basis of the philosophy of Anarchism is explained by comrade Kropotkin in a masterly, yet popular, manner. We recommend the work to every intelligent reader as the best exposition of scientific Anarchism extant.

MANIFESTO TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

In the Matter of the Extradition of the Mexican Revolutionists

It is now over four months since the intrigues of the dictator of Mexico have dragged us into prison, in violation of the constitution of this country, as well as the constitution of Mexico, corrupted American officials, as he did with those of our own country, covered with mire the civilization of this nation, as he has bargained and prostituted the culture of the land of our fathers. And for four months we have asked ourselves bewildered questions behind the iron bars of our prison, if we are in fact in the free fatherland of Washington, in the "classic land of liberty," in the great republic of brotherhood and love of which were dreaming the fair men and women landing from the good ship "Mayflower," or if by some magic we have been transported to the sombre reign of Nicholas II., or to the dark abodes of equatorial Africa.

It is over four months—on the 23rd of August of this year—that three of the signers of this manifesto, Ricardo Flores Magon, Antonio I. Villarreal, and Librado Rivera, members of the organizing board of the Liberal Party of Mexico, sat in our rooms tending to our correspondence when six individuals armed with guns, not wearing on their breasts the insignia of police officials, invaded our abiding place in this city, placed their guns to our heads and asked our surrender. After we surrendered and our hands were tied, we were beaten in such manner that one of us fell, losing his consciousness. There was no order of court in existence for this arrest, and since, by the sworn testimony of Captain Furlong, their detective, it appears that the money of which Porfirio Diaz robs the people of Mexico was the means that gave to said individuals the impulse to trample the Constitution of the United States under their feet by arresting us without warrant, by taking possession of our papers without our consent and without search warrant or any other authorization for so doing. Policemen of this city whom the people sustain for its safety and defense, but who at opportunity are the first to violate the law, are the first to mockingly discard civilization, and are allowed to commit crimes at the instigation of a foreign despot.

Five successive charges have been filed against us up to this day; five unfounded, absurd, senseless "charges" or rather pretexts to hold us imprisoned for an indefinite time, and by such cowardly and savage methods prevent the execution of our honorable, humane, and just aim in life, namely, to aid the Mexican people towards freedom and well being.

Four of these charges have been rejected, but the fifth, charging us with conspiracy to organize, in the Territory of Arizona, a military expedition to overthrow the despotism of Porfirio Diaz, is insisted upon with a suspicious tenacity of purpose—in spite of the demonstrated facts that the principal witnesses against us committed perjury, that the submitted documentary evidence consisted of gross forgeries, made with stupidity and lack of talent

for the job—that has more and more convinced us that in the place of our assumed conspiracy for law breaking purposes, there exists as a matter of fact a powerful, monstrous conspiracy to keep us in prison and in the end to surrender us to the bloody vengeance of the black beast, who for over thirty years has kept the unfortunate country of Mexico in a state of continuous mourning.

The proceedings of United States Commissioner Van Dyke and United States District Attorney Lawler in our matters were of decided and typical Mexican character. We were placed under bail of five thousand dollars each, to keep freedom out of our reach, though in other similar cases five hundred dollars had been considered sufficient. They admitted an unfounded charge which later was completely annihilated. This capricious charge served to give time to prepare false evidence. Sworn witnesses who were convicted of gross perjury and falsehoods under oath were allowed to go away undisturbed to enjoy the gain of their false oaths, which the law is supposed to punish severely. The documentary evidence submitted, declared by intelligent experts to be gross forgeries and a structure of shameful lies, criminal falsifications and perjury by Vasquez, was considered sufficient by Lawler and Van Dyke to hold us for extradition to Arizona. For them and their like such evidence is ample proof of the fact that we conspired to place on foot a military expedition in that territory to overthrow the despotism of Porfirio Diaz.

Lazaro Gutierrez de Lara was arrested on the twenty-seventh of September of this year and has been held in this prison ever since. The charges made against him were also mere pretexts in order to deprive him of his liberty, in this way making it impossible for him to do his share in the work of redemption of the Mexican people. The despotic government of Mexico has found an easy way to keep its political enemies imprisoned by misusing the extradition treaties with this government, treaties dealing with criminals. According to these treaties the American government must for a term of forty days hold in prison any person that might be called for by the Mexican government with a cause pending against them for such crimes as are specified in said treaties. And if after expiration of that term no proofs are presented against the parties under arrest, they have to be set free. Abusing the terms and provisions of these treaties the dictator, Porfirio Diaz, demands the arrest of his political enemies by using slander, and he can hold them in prison for indefinite time, for after forty days are over a new calumny is formulated for another forty days' detention, and so on to his heart's desire.

This happens in the case of Gutierrez de Lara, and the same has happened every time when the Nero on the throne of Mexico needed the imprisonment of political opponents. The signers of this manifesto have been held in prison upon petition of the Mexican government, and many other political refugees have met with the same fate, without in any one of the cases the charges having been proved upon which arrests were obtained, but to substantiate which said despot has never troubled his mind. Van

Dyke and Lawler on their part have taken great pains to keep Gutierrez de Lara imprisoned and thus assist the dictator of Mexico in his campaign of persecution and revenge.

In this nation, for whose liberty and honor the big men and women of 1776 shed their blood upon the battlefields of New England, by their humble, dutiful, noble sacrifice of limb and life, laying the cornerstone of a future of well being and civilization, there are men who deliberately scoff the aspirations of those martyrs and pervert into an abode of money mongers the places where upright, clean officials are supposed to render justice.

What we have told is but a detail of a vast conspiracy concocted in the darkness of an impure diplomacy with the sole object to exterminate with one stroke our aim and purpose of life: to give to the Mexican people bread, liberty, and education, the necessary elements that can uplift humanity, dignified to march erect and firm towards a more glorious future.

Since the year 1900 we have been engaged in Mexico in a formal struggle against the despotism, using the press. Our papers have been ferociously persecuted and we have passed long periods of time behind prison bars, and several times we have found ourselves at the point of being shot for the crime of writing the truth. Long periods of time we have not seen the sunlight, shut up in disease-infected cells, from which people issue to the hospitals or the cemetery. One can easily count the few that have remained alive after having been confined for some time in the cells destined for fighters in the political field. Many times the dagger has been thrust in the backs of our men. But in spite of all this, we did struggle in Mexico, until on June 9th of the year 1903 the government by one stroke of the pen declared that the police should impede the publication of our papers. In 1904 we emigated to this country in order to continue from here our purpose of life, to shake the people from their slumber, that they may throw off the despotism weighing on their backs, and we have remained at our post ever since. We have not sold out to the despot, and for this reason he bears for us deathly hatred. We serve in the cause of the humble and lowly, and for this reason we have remained poor in earthly riches.

In San Antonio, Texas, we took up again the publication of *Regeneracion* in the year 1904, one of the many newspapers that had been edited by us in Mexico. After a few weeks of publication of our paper a ruffian paid by Diaz threatened us with violence.

Not finding proper protection in San Antonio, we moved in February of the year 1905 to St. Louis, Mo., where we continued to publish our paper, *Regeneracion.* Angered by the persistence with which we continued our work for freedom in spite of all obstacles placed in our way, Porfirio Diaz used diplomatic channels, and through his ambassadors he influenced the United States government officials to assist him in our persecution. The first effect of the combined action of the United States postoffice officials and Diaz was the withdrawal of second-class privileges from the paper *Regeneracion.* We had complied with all the provisions of the postal laws in order to avoid withdrawal of

these privileges. And yet the general administrator of the postal department of Washington at that time, Mr. Cortelyou, with neither justification nor shame, declared that *Regeneracion* could not enjoy second-class privileges because over fifty per cent. of the copies were destined for circulation in Mexico. This was the first signal of the formidable conspiracy hatched against us by Mexican officials, of which the unwarranted action by Van Dyke and Lawler to the degree of holding us without any justification whatever is nothing but a detail.

In September of the year 1905 the organizing board (junta) of the Liberal Party of Mexico was constituted, and in the following month we were persecuted by means of a Mexican official sent by Diaz to proceed against us upon the basis of several articles published in *Regeneracion*. The men under whose names the paper was published, were imprisoned, the money of the Mexican people, side-tracked for evil purpose by the tyrant, was spent upon attorneys for prosecution and upon those human bloodhounds known to all the world under the names of Pinkertons or other denominations. They seized everything in our offices and ended with a villainous action. The seized correspondence was illegally and criminally placed at the disposal of the Mexican government. We were placed at liberty under bonds and, realizing that at an opportune time new charges would be placed against us of a similar character and purpose as the ones just disposed of, we paid the bail and went to Canada. To Canada we were followed by the pack of Pinkertons who spied our movements.

After the Liberal Party had been sufficiently organized, in spite of all obstacles, and after the organizing board had issued on July first of the year 1906 the program of the Liberal Party, after we had become fully convinced by a wide experience that the overthrow of despotism by the peaceful methods of ballot, open platform, press, clubs, was an impossibility, and being further of the conviction that an environment of liberty and justice has to be created as an indispensable factor for the upward evolution of the people, and that in absence of organization the great masses of the laboring people would remain eternally slaves, we came to the decision to end by a revolution a state and condition of things that is offensive to civilization and to the most rudimentary humanitarian principles.

We began to lay stress upon the revolutionary work. But the treachery of spies, placed in our camps, shattered the first serious attempts of rebellion of the oppressed people in September of last year. Many leaders fell into the hands of Diaz, and the penitentiaries were filled with revolutionists. The vice-president of the organizing board, Juan Sarabia, languishes at this hour in the somber prison of the island of San Juan de Ulua, condemned to seven years of imprisonment for having been a co-worker in our cause, and any day the news may reach us that he has been shot or poisoned within the prison walls.

During this present year over a thousand citizens have been imprisoned under suspicion of having connections with us. As many more have been done away with, have disappeared, as-

sassinated under the cover of darkness. Honorable women have been thrown into prison, subjected to the brutalities of vile soldiers and more vile wardens, for being considered to be connected with us. The workingmen and women have been forbidden to read the papers which defend their rights, and in many factories toilers have suffered corporal punishment for the crime of receiving visits of their dear ones outside. Any person found reading any kind of a paper that does not flatter the domestic Nero is immediately bound over for imprisonment. The private mail is cynically opened at the post-offices. Persons under suspicion of disaffection with the government are martyrized to force from their lips the betrayal of revolutionists. Even little children, nine to twelve years old, have been dragged to prison, accused of rebellion.

This side of the border the persecution has been kept up with no less tenacity. On October 19 of last year Antonio I. Villarreal, Lauro Aguirre and Ramon Cano were arrested in El Paso, Texas. They were accused of intending to place on foot in that city an army to overthrow the dictator Diaz. This was a mere pretext to keep the defendants behind bars. At the same time the Mexican government asked for their extradition for supposed robberies and assassinations committed in Mexico. As in all other cases of the same character the Mexican government never bothered its mind with even mere attempts to furnish evidence for its vile accusations. Lauro Aguirro and Ramon Cano came free under five thousand dollars bail. Villarreal was not included in this privilege, because United States government officials had promised Diaz to extradite him upon the basis of the fact that he was not yet three years in this country, and that he was to be considered as an undesirable immigrant. To permit this infamy Minister Bonaparte gave telegraphic orders to the United States commissioner of El Paso, Texas, to stop the farcial procedure for violation of neutrality laws and to turn over Villarreal to the immigration officials for trial and deportation to Mexico. Thanks to the fact that he was able to escape the watchfulness of the immigration officials he is still alive, though imprisoned.

Several weeks before this incident happened there were arrested in Douglas and The Mowry, Territory of Arizona, Tomas D. Espinosa, Gabriel Rubio, Ildefonso R. Martinez, Bruno Trevino, Lazaro Puente, Carlos Humbert, Abraham Salcido, Leonardo Villarreal, and other citizens, under the pretext that they intended to place on foot an armed force in said territory to overthrow the despotism of Porfirio Diaz. It is exactly the same charge which was laid as basis in the local proceedings against Ricardo Flores Magon, Antonio I. Villarreal and Librado Rivera. And also in this case without substantiating by the slightest bit of evidence the proceedings for violation of neutrality laws, United States government officials ordered the extradition of Lazaro Puente, Abraham Salcido, Bruno Trevino, Carlos Humbert, Leonardo Villarreal, and Gabriel Rubio to the authorities of Mexico as undesirable immigrants, an argument fetched by the never-scrupulous officials to surrender political refugees to the vengeance of the hyenas of Mexico. In virtue of this ukase the

citizens referred to are incarcerated in the prison fortress of the island of San Juan de Ulua, State of Vera Cruz, which they will probably never leave alive.

During the last months of 1906 the citizens Crescencio Villarreal Marquez, Demetrio Castro, Trinidad Garcia, and other persons, were arrested in Del Rio, Texas, upon request of Porfirio Diaz, made to the governor of the State of Texas. A ridiculous charge of assassination and robbery, supposed to have been committed in the state of Coahuila, Mexico, served as pretext for the incarceration of those honorable citizens. The government of Texas looked through the infamy of the government of Diaz and was on the point of placing in liberty the vilely calumniated men, when Diaz, in fear of not being able to kill his political enemies, appealed to the United States government officials, who, trampling under their feet the sovereignty of the State of Texas in a way worthy of a Diaz, made the same demand of extradition upon the basis of the special treaty with Mexico which the State of Texas had been acting upon.

From this it can be seen that the United States government officials are disposed and ever ready to do anything that might serve the interests of Mexico. In the end the United States commissioner in San Antonio, Texas, set the citizens of Del Rio, Texas, free.

At about the same time, in November, 1906, two men were arrested in St. Louis, Mo., and hurriedly and secretly transferred to Ironton, Mo.,—Librado Rivera and Aaron Lopez Manzano, the first a member of the organizing board, the latter a comrade in our work. The secret transfer to Ironton, Mo., was made for the purpose of attempting kidnapping and extradition to Mexico. But the press lifted up its voice to denounce the vile manipulations of Diaz and the United States government officials, and from this exposure the appearance had to be given that they had been arrested upon basis of some charges. Porfirio Diaz again abused the privileges granted in the treaties for extradition of criminals and he formed a slanderous charge against Rivera. But the United States commissioner of St. Louis, Mo., considered it a crime and an indelible dishonor to accept money from the government of Mexico for the purpose of persecuting political refugees, and he set Rivera free, and shortly after this also Aaron Lopez Manzano, in spite of the intrigues of Diaz.

Manuel Sarabia, member of the organizing board, was kidnapped this year in Douglas, Arizona, passed into Mexico, and turned over to the authorities of that country. Sarabia had been arrested without order of court on the thirtieth of June, and on the same night American police officials dragged him from the prison of Douglas, placed him in an automobile, brought him over the line, and handed him over to the minions of Porfirio Diaz. Sarabia would have perished, had not the citizens of Douglas protested as one man and demanded that the victim of that outrage be returned to the United States. In this dirty business was implicated the Mexican consul, Antonio Maza, as intellectual author of the deed who spent money from Diaz to have such a grave offense committed in this country. A prosecution of the kidnappers fol-

lowed, among the defendants figuring said Maza, but the money of Diaz, and the pressure brought to bear from government officials to save the guilty parties, were sufficient to produce a verdict that the kidnappers were not guilty. The name of the American people had again been made the plaything of the rugged hyena of Mexico, of prostituted diplomacy, and bold bad faith.

As the readers will see from all this, there exists a far and wide conspiracy concocted in the shadows of a tortuous diplomacy, to secure for Mexico the continued existence of an African despotism, by surrendering to the chiefs who oppress that unfortunate country all those who do not bend their backs and who dare to uplift their voices for the salvation of fourteen millions of human beings.

We have not committed a single crime, as was amply and completely proved before United States Comimssioner Van Dyke. But in as far as it is necessary for Porfirio Diaz that we be assassinated, so that he may tranquilly rob and kill the folks of Mexico, the verdict was rendered that we are to be extradited to Arizona, whence we will be passed on to Mexico, as has happened to many others in the past, and there certain death will meet us, and with our lives we shall pay for the *crime of having loved mankind.*

That is our crime! We are revolutionists, and we are proud in this consciousness.

What do we want? The program of the Liberal Party issued on the first of July of the year 1906 is the sum and substance of our aims and aspirations, in order to enable the Mexican people to work out its upward evolution. We want bread for all, education for all, liberty for all. We consider it absurd that a few should possess the earth, and the many not have a place to lay down their heads for rest. We want, then, that the land be accessible to all, just the same as the air, the light, the warm sun rays are there for all creatures on earth. We consider it absurd that those who neither toil nor produce should enjoy all at the expense of those who till and toil and have a life of misery, of privation, of exhausted fatigue as long as they have any strength to give, and a life of shame and humiliation, and abject degradation, when weakened by age and long years of hard labor they are thrown aside and cast adrift by the bosses, like old and diseased cattle left to provide for themselves as best they can.

We think that political liberty is a beautiful lie so long as it has not for its basis economic liberty, and towards the conquest of that liberty our steps are directed. We are of the opinion that the social problem looming up on the horizon of humanity as a formidable great unknown, must be solved by the workingmen themselves, and it is for this reason and purpose that with all our forces, and with all our love we demand that the proletariat of Mexico organize and by so doing enable itself to take part in the tremendous struggle that alone will liberate the proletariat of this world, the struggle which some day—may be in the near future—will place all the goods of this earth within reach and power of all human beings.

We are revolutionists, but not of the type that has become

sadly classical for unfortunate Latin America. We stand and live and work for high ideals and noble ends, and it is for this reason that the magnates of the political and money powers in the United States and of both republics are interested in our extermination. The mere fact of our existence is a menace to those who live from the sweat of the people; and for this reason we are doomed to die.

In order to arrest and detain four humble revolutionists, streams of gold had to be spent, the combined diplomacy of two countries had to be hitched up, and the ambassador of Mexico, accredited in Washington, had to make a special trip to this city to play football with the principles of liberty laid down in the constitutions of two republics, to outrage the dignity of the American people, and to permit venal officials to drag their dirty feet over the face of modern civilization.

To you, men and women of this country, so proud of the good name of your institutions, we call and appeal to help us break down the criminal conspiracy which has been formed to retain us indefinitely in prison, and finally to surrender us to the beastly vengeance of the despots of Mexico. To permit that those who are called into office to look out for and watch over the interests of the people be the first to bring dishonor is a crime against civilization, which a civilized people must not allow to pass in remaining inactive in the face of the iniquities committed by the tyrants. In this sad struggle your honor is involved. Remember that figuratively only the other day this free country of America was the harbor of refuge for all the oppressed of the world, that upon this soil precious seeds have been dropped by those valorous spirits, by those noble minds, who suffered in the lands beyond the seas, far from the frontiers of this cherished land, directed their looks and their steps to these shores as to a land of promise embellished by an environment of liberty and justice.

Workers of the world! Our cause is your cause. The cause of the proletariat does know no frontiers. The interests of the working people are the same in all lands under all climates, and all latitudes of our globe. Help us! Display your irresistible forces to down the formidable conspiracy of the tyrant and of the capitalists of two countries, a conspiracy planned and plotted and conceived to hold back the evolution of a people that is desirous to break its chains. Remember that only by unity of action and solidarity of effort the workers will emancipate themselves. Do not permit that an entire race be sacrificed to the interests of those who suck the life blood of the toilers of all nations.

Press of America, and of all other lands: The newspapers are the bridle and reins which hold back the abuses of those in power, and by their might they constitute a state within the state. Wherever there is an abuse in evidence it is up to the press to enter the arena and to denounce the wrong. If the press fails to do so, its high mission is prostituted, and crime connived at and sanctioned in shameful silence. Denounce in the face of the world the conspiracy of which we are victims. Speak out loud in protest. It is an outrage to civilization to persecute its

servants like wild beasts. The press cannot, must not, consent that in this century justice be violated in open daylight, the rights of man outraged, and civilization sacrificed, because thus it pleases the mongrel interests of a mere handful of bandits.

We have spoken the truth. Death may be near us, at the hands of our tyrants, and a lie shall not stain our lips to the last, our lips that always have moved to say the truth. For truth we have lived; for truth we shall know how to die when our destiny is accomplished.

Given at the county jail of Los Angeles, California, in the United States of America, on December twenty-seventh, of the year 1907.

RICARDO FLORES MAGON,
ANTONIO I. VILLARREAL,
LIBRADO RIVERA,
LAZARO GUTIERREZ DE LARA.

❧ ❧ ❧

THE RIGHTFUL SANCTIONS OF MARRIAGE

By LAWRENCE ROCHESTER.

NEITHER pope, priest, or parson can sanctify, nor legislature, judge, or magistrate rightfully sanction that which Nature has made discordant, abhorrent, and repugnant.

A discordant household is no fit place for the begetting or rearing of children.

Gestation and infancy demand a peaceful, loving, and harmonious environment.

A man and a woman living together, bound by no tie but a legal contract, are nothing more or less than legalized prostitutes of the basest sort.

The only tie which sanctifies the sexual relation is some degree, at least, of love, trust, and confidence. When these have gone there is no marriage; the continuance of such relation is then a repulsive and abhorrent prostitution; and any law which would compel the continuance of such relations is an unmitigated and damnable despotism.

Any law which prevents mutually devoted couples from coming together, is a degrading tyranny, which is the fruitful cause of the gross immoralities at which the community stands aghast at the present time.

The ignorance of ecclesiastics, their bigotry and intolerance endorsed and applauded by fanatical Holy

Willies and Holy Nancys of Churchianity, have caused more murders and misery in the world than all other causes combined, and made civil governments, which should be free and just, potent engines to oppress the people.

To expect the young and inexperienced to decide at a given moment, with certain and infallible judgment, as to the character of their consorts and compel them to live together in a life-time bond of marriage against which Nature rebels, is a most damnable folly; and such a bond is an outrageous despotism, and hypocrisy of the basest sort.

A tie designed for Angels and Saints is not fitted for either brutes or imperfect men. Laws and governments are both cruel and inoperative when not in accord with the characters of the citizens or subjects which they undertake to regulate.

Men and women can not be made good, wise, moral, or righteous by law, but they can be tortured and made miserable by unwise, imprudent, and despotic laws, which cause to be brought into the world lunatics, imbeciles, and paupers.

* * *

ANARCHISM

A PLEA FOR THE IMPERSONAL.

By H. KELLY.

THE student of Anarchism must often ask himself why, in this most Anarchistic of all countries, the Anarchist movement has made, and is making, such slow progress. That Anarchism concerns itself with the individual, and that America is the most individualistic of all civilized countries, is hardly debatable; and yet the Anarchist movement, which in itself represents the definite, concrete expression of the Anarchist philosophy, is almost where it was twenty years ago. The Mutualist wing, which found its ablest exponent in Dyer D. Lum is extinct; the Individualist wing has lost so much ground that it can hardly be called a movement; and the Communist wing, the only one of the three that shows any signs of growth, has—as a movement—made but little progress. To those who may be disposed to question the above statements, I will say right now that

First,—As to the Mutualist section, during twelve years' active work as an Anarchist propagandist I have seen or heard no signs of it.

Second,—If a theory which, after thirty years' active work by such an able man as Benj. R. Tucker, can show nothing better than one small publication, *Liberty*, that appears but once in two months, and probably one or two public speakers who lecture once or twice a year, can be called a movement, then our statement may not be believed. Further, it is well known that even *Liberty* would not exist, were it not that its editor and publisher —a man of means—foots the deficit. In short, Mr. Tucker is the "movement."

Third,—The Communist wing has a number of papers in different languages and carries on a more or less energetic oral propaganda throughout the country in Yiddish, English, Italian, German, Bohemian, and Spanish; but if compared with the growth of Anarchist ideas, sentiments, and methods at large, the development of the movement has been slow indeed. I am not concerned in this paper with the very important fact that Anarchist ideas and even methods have been very much clarified and systematized since the Pittsburg convention, in 1884; it is important and encouraging, but why has the numerical increase been so small?

Many and diverse reasons will no doubt be given, if the facts are accepted, as I believe they will be. Chief among those reasons will be the desire for ease and comfort, lack of moral courage, the spirit of compromise, environment, and so forth. All of these can be and will be given with considerable justification, but in so doing, do we not admit the unfitness of Anarchist ideas to the modern man? It seems so to us; but believing in those ideas, we seek farther afield.

Men may be moral cowards, desire ease and comfort more than liberty of thought and expression, have the spirit of compromise deeply rooted in them and be unable to rise superior to their surroundings; but, after all, they have the privilege of rejecting any theory which, in their opinion, puts too great a restraint upon their desire to live and be happy.

At the risk of appearing heretical, I venture to say that the brake upon the wheel of development of Anar-

chism is the adulation of the individual. The mass of people in this or any other country are not self conscious egoists, but I am bold to say that egotistic principles rule this country, and they also make themselves felt in the Anarchist movement. It is a truism that society is an aggregation of units, and that it requires free units to make a free society—a fact which Socialists overlook: our meaning is quite different. Take the average man, aristocrat, bourgeois, or worker, and advance the following theory: Here is a proposition which, if applied to life, will do away with the necessity of exploitation and its evils. You, Mr. Aristocrat or Mr. Bourgeois, will be able to do healthy, useful work and do away with the anxiety of the present. The earth is as fertile as it was, and with modern scientific methods you will have more than sufficient, and be respected and loved by that large portion of your fellow-men who now hate and despise you. And you, Mr. Workingman, "you have a world to win and nothing to lose but your chains."—Or you appeal to them on the basis of personal freedom, self-expression, and so forth. This is putting it upon a purely personal basis; let us see how it works. The three classes appealed to soon find that it is more than probable that these ideas will not be realized in their time and generation; at least there is the possibility; so the reward for their labors, if any, is a spiritual one, and the loss a material one. They were appealed to on a material basis, material even in the sense that working for the realization of an ideal is spiritual; it has to do with the future; the right to express yourself in sex and other personal matters is material, because it deals with the present. It is as with the successful politician, before and after election. Perhaps he had ideals before he got the office, but after his arrival his ideals assume a personal bias. John Burns was an idealist and revolutionist before he was elected to Parliament; he was convinced that *society* must be reconstructed; but after he was elected he said that "the day of the agitator has passed, the day of the legislator has arrived." What need of a revolution! Have *I* not been elected? The revolution is here—for me. The capitalist who wanted Anarchism because it promised him comforts, without the anxiety of business, strikes, etc., finds himself slipping down in the social scale, as he

devotes his time to propagating beautiful, but unpopular theories; and that not being what he expected, he quits. The workingman who attached himself because he wanted more comforts, finds that the best way to obtain them is by adapting himself to things as they are, instead of trying to reconstruct society; and he thus withdraws.

We are all egoists in the sense that the mainspring of our actions is the desire to obtain happiness and avoid pain. There are higher and lower forms of happiness, as there are higher and lower forms of art, and it is as true now as it was in Aristotle's time that the man who places his talents, genius, time, and energy at the service of humanity represents a higher type than he who simply strives for himself or his immediate family. Self-interest is the most potent of propelling forces with many of our actions, but that very self-interest is what deters most people from declaring themselves the enemies of the existing social order and its conventional lies. He who proclaims himself a reformer or revolutionist because he wishes to better his economic condition, or desires freedom in his personal relations, rests his faith on uncertain ground, and a slight change in either is enough to turn the scale and make a defender instead of an enemy of present conditions. Concern yourself with yourself, and your desire to change social conditions soon crystalizes into a desire to change *your* condition, and your career as a social reformer has seen its finish. Some might urge that what I say is an admission that Anarchism is not coming in our time. To such let me reply that I neither affirm nor deny; prophecy is not in my line; but I do insist that, to speed Anarchism or make it possible, it must become more humanitarian and less personal. I am convinced that Anarchism, like every other social or political theory, must have an economic basis; it must become more a mass movement and less an individual one. This is not to question, much less deny, the desire for personal liberty or self-expression, or that Communism, Collectivism, or Mutualism must be *the* system. Anarchism does not concern itself with any special theory of economics, but an economic base there must be, unless it is to become an abstraction. Personal liberty and self-expression will always appeal with greater

force to certain individuals than the why's and wherefore's of obtaining a living; it may well be that they are the pioneers of humanity in its march to higher things. We feel of them and akin to them, but mankind, as a whole, is much more concerned with its own present than with the future of coming generations, and comfort is a more potent factor in determining our lives than theories of liberty.

The sex question is probably more in evidence in the American Anarchist movement than in the European. In fact, the Individualist section—if we except *Liberty*—has almost merged itself into the movement for sex reform; certainly most of those we know make that question their touchstone. This is not because the Europeans desire freedom in matters of sex or sex discussion less than we do, but because their Anarchism is less introspective than ours. They concern themselves more with the mass movement than we do; they fight the capitalist; we fight Comstock. Instead of participating in the trade unions, organizing the unemployed, or indulging in soap-box oratory, we rent comfortable halls and charge ten cents' admission. Added to that are, in many cases, ten cents carfare, and Anarchism has become a luxury. Instead of inspiring the workers with revolutionary ideas we teach them speculative theories of liberty, with the result that our Mrs. Grannis's and "Little Tim" Sullivans' are increasing the number of oppressive laws on the statute books. "The right to be born well" is surely worth fighting for, more especially because it means fighting for the unborn; but in the midst of inequality of opportunity it must apply largely to those whose progenitors are economically well situated; in other words, the exploiting classes; and being such, they do not immediately concern us. It may be and probably will be said that in fighting for sex freedom we fight for the present and future generations; all that is quite true, yet it does not gainsay our point that there is not enough idealism in the desire for self expression to maintain a strong, healthy movement.

The Socialists and Single Taxers do precisely the same thing in the economic field as the Anarchists do in matters pertaining to personal freedom. Priding them-

selves on their practicability and common sense—whatever the latter may mean—they appeal to man's self-interest, with results that would be amusing if they were not pathetic. The Single Taxers, as a party, have distinctly lost ground during the past ten years; yet our dear old Bolton Hall, most charming and idealistic of men, repeats the same old cry in his "Three Acres and Liberty," while the Socialists are at this moment distributing a leaflet to the unemployed, asking them to vote for Socialism and get a job, though it must be apparent to even the most superficial mind that voting for Socialism is a very roundabout way of getting a "job," and working for the single tax is not likely to improve the individual's position for a long time to come. The Anarchist movement in America alone furnishes plenty of examples of those who came here from Europe revolutionists, idealists—and poor men. Accumulating a little money, they invested it in tenement houses or other forms of "business," and as the "business" absorbed them more and more, they gradually shed their radical ideas, becoming doctrinaires or plain philistines. Some sought to harmonize the idealist and practical by becoming Marxian Socialists, for according to latter day interpretations of the materialistic conception of history they can be class-conscious Socialists and tenement house proprietors at the same time. With these people Anarchism was a personal thing. They were the centre of gravity; they rebelled against conditions because the latter restricted *their* actions and *their* liberty. Liberty with them had to do with material things, and finding not only no immediate chance of improving their economic condition in the struggle for freedom, but every possibility of jeopardizing what position they did have, they promptly withdrew.

There is still a third class of propagandists; but as they are but few in America, I shall deal briefly with them. I refer to those whom, for lack of a better description, I shall call "Tolstoyans." They hold largely to the theory of non-resistance, (some more strongly than others) and believe that by getting back to the land and engaging in useful, productive labor they set an example for others to follow. This almost invariably leads to sophistry, for they are unable to live except by

adapting themselves to the methods of those around them, selling their produce at the highest price obtainable, or by assistance from those "who live in the system," as the saying is. I have in mind a colony of people holding these ideas, located at Perleigh, Essex, England. They lived, some twenty or more of them, in a large barn and, true to their humanitarian instincts, gave shelter to a tramp one night; unfortunately, the tramp had the small-pox, and so the entire colony became afflicted. As a matter of self-protection the villagers were forced to quarantine them, furnish them with doctors, nurses, etc., and before they were over the trouble this small village of poor people were saddled with a debt of nearly three hundred pounds sterling. Hairs might be split over this very interesting question: Had the colonists a right to express themselves and get the small-pox, and by so doing force other people to pay for that self-expression or get the small-pox themselves? I am concerned here with but one phase of the question, as with all those who seek to live their own lives. That they had a right to live their own lives goes without question; but that it is humanitarian or idealistic, I deny. To live one's life in one's own way is a fascinating thing; propaganda by example is often more effective than the written or spoken word; but if there are any who believe that to bury ourself on a farm or in a colony is to spread libertarian or humanitarian ideas, a study of such ventures will soon undeceive them. Liberty to do that which one feels himself or herself best fitted for is essential to all progress, but let us not deceive ourselves into the belief that, because we desire a particular form of life, it is necessarily the best one to live. It is not sufficient to do what you want; rather want to do the best thing. In short, if interest in freedom centres around our personality, that interest disappears in proportion as our liberty and well being are increased. Philosophic speculations as to freedom do not make for vitality in a movement; activity is wanted, and the one place for activity is among the people. Mock and insult the masses because of their seeming supineness in allowing themselves to be exploited; but remember it is death to one's enthusiasm and an end to activity to separate from them.

We feel the "call of the wild" as keenly as those who think humanity will be saved, or at least appreciably helped, if they sell butter and eggs instead of paper napkins; but we are under no illusions about it. We shall probably succumb in the end; but we at least have made a fight, and we go, knowing that we go not to further an ideal, but to live our own life,—something we have not done these many years. If the Anarchist movement in America is to again have vitality it must return to first principles: To make of Anarchism a humanitarian theory, rather than a desire for self-expression. The latter must indeed not be lost sight of, but the former must be the keynote. To urge upon our readers and hearers that if it be glorious to struggle for freedom and self-expression for oneself, it were still more glorious to struggle for freedom and self-expression for others. To urge upon the young to interest themselves in a movement to save the millions of children slaving out their childish lives in factory, mill, and mine, to save those thousands upon thousands of unfortunate men and women who are killed or maimed every year by preventable accidents; to restore to happy homes the millions of tramps and hundreds of thousands of prostitutes; these and many other things. If we appeal to a man upon this basis and win him, he will stay with us—not for a day or an hour—but till the end.

❧ ❧ ❧

THE TRUMPET

By G. K. CHESTERTON.

THE brown fog grew quite red down by the river; the obscurity of it had something instant and menacing, as of something too big and too close to be seen. It was as if the sky had thrust its own huge face into mine. As I groped through this strangling darkness, I distinctly heard from somewhere in the innumerable cells or caverns of that darkness the distinct noise of a trumpet. What it was and whence it came I cannot tell. It may have been some young bugler of the Horse Guards blowing his bugle for fun; it may have been some young angel endeavoring to have a trump

of doom and a small day of judgment on his own account. It may have been an Imperialist somewhere in his own top bedroom blowing his country's trumpet or his own. I only know that it was the sound of a trumpet, and I should know it again in the thick of a crashing orchestra of all the instruments upon earth.

* * * * * * * * *

And as I listened for some repetition of the sound there came back into my mind, I cannot tell why, a fragment which I read last week from a report of Mr. H. G. Wells' speech at the City Temple. Mr. H. G. Wells was endeavoring to soothe the audience or congregation on the subject of Socialism. He assured them that Socialism would not be a sudden revolution, the success of which would be announced "with trumpets from Tower Hill." It would be a slow and scientific process, which would gradually adapt itself to us or us to itself.

This, at least, was the substance of his view. It is a view commonly taken by modern thinkers discussing modern tendencies, and it is a view which I for one can never manage either to understand or to endure. Why is it comforting to be told that a thing will come slowly, and alarming to be told that it will come quickly? To my simple mind it would always seem that it all depended what the thing was. It is not against the thing that it is swift, or in its favor that it is slow. On the one hand, energy is all the finer if it is sudden energy. On the other hand, paralysis is not any nicer because it is creeping paralysis.

If Socialism is the best human solution of our hideous modern problem, if Socialism can really make men comfortable without making them comfortable slaves, if it really is a human answer to an inhuman riddle, if its really will lift off all our consciences the unbearable burden and waking nightmare of human poverty, if it will do this without interfering with any necessary human freedom or essential human dignity, then in God's name fight for it, and blow from Tower Hill every trumpet you can find. I shall not blame you if you blow trumpets from the Tower, yes, and fire guns from the Tower for such a fulfilment as that. You have blown trumpets and fired guns for much meaner things.

But if, on the other hand, Socialism has some spiritual quality of slavery, if it is against the instinct of the freedom and ownership of man, if it goes against something ancient in the human heart, then it is no sort of comfort to be told that it will come slowly and without any special shock. If it is slavery, it is no comfort to be told that we shall be slowly enslaved. If it is fundamentally non-human, it is no comfort to be told that we shall be slowly dehumanized. If it is absolutely necessary that my favorite brother should be turned into a chimpanzee, I certainly think that I should prefer him to be turned into a chimpanzee at once, by a magician or a witch out of a fairy tale touching him with a wand. Even that would be more tolerable than sitting down with him to dinner night after night, and seeing every night that he looked a shade more like a chimpanzee than he had looked the night before.

* * * * * * * * *

If Socialism is a rescue, let is come quick; that is the essence of a rescue. If it is a disease, there is nothing pleasant about the idea that it comes slowly, like the worst diseases. In Mr. H. Belloc's Book of Rhymes, just published (it is called "Cautionary Verses for Children," and is intended partly to please children, but more especially to displease politicians)—in this work, I say, there occurs the excellent description of how Jim left his nurse in a crowd and was in consequence eaten by a lion.

Bang!
With open jaws a lion sprang.

This strikes the note of dogma and revolution, and there is nothing necessarily evil about it. The lion may be the noble lion of mediæval legend, who spared the weak, especially the virgin and the dead. But having once discovered that the lion was of the cruel and devouring sort, it is no pleasure to us to learn in the simple words of Mr. Belloc that he

Began to eat
The boy, beginning with his feet.

Then the poet, unconsciously alluding surely to the

theory of humanity transformed by a slow and scientific process, goes on to say pathetically:

> Now just imagine how it feels
> When first your toes, and then your heels,
> And then by gradual degrees
> Your shins and ankles, calves and knees
> Are slowly eaten bit by bit.
> No wonder Jim detested it!

And no wonder, I should say, humanity has always detested it and will continue to do so. A bad revolution is a much worse evolution. A good evolution would be a much better revolution. Humanity loves the trumpet: the fierce and final note. It cannot understand that sort of semi-Fabian intellect which can take the huge responsibility of scheming for a thing and yet cannot take the responsibility of fighting for it.

Mr. H. G. Wells endeavors to win over the mass of men sitting in the City Temple by saying that he does not mean to blow trumpets of revolution from the Tower. I beg to assure him with tears in my eyes, and with the pathos of a perpetual and perpetually renewed admiration, that he will never win over any real mass of men anywhere until he is prepared to blow trumpets from the Tower. I can only go onward through the fog which seems in parts the color of mud and in parts of blood, but I strain my ears to hear the trumpet. And I have not heard it again.—London *Daily News*.

MARRIAGE OR FREE UNION; WHICH?

By JOHN RUSSELL CORYELL.

PERHAPS it would have been more definite if I had put marriage ceremony in place of the word marriage, since it is precisely that which is in question; but, after all, an explanation of marriage is essential to this discussion, since the major part of the civilized world assumes the ceremony as inevitable to the state of marriage. Indeed it is not stating it too broadly to say that the civilized world understands marriage to mean a monogamous relation which can be entered into only by means of a ceremony, at least of a legal character, and preferable of a sacramental one.

I may say that I shall try to keep my own bias in the background as much as possible, though I do not hope for as much success as if it were a matter on which I felt less strongly. Nevertheless I realize that this is a subject which as much as any other demands dispassionate discussion. It is not enough to prove that a marriage ceremony is a foolish and ineffective device, because we have before us the question involving a comparison between it and another device, called a free union.

Please believe that I am not pretending to say the last word on this subject, nor even a very wise one; but I have listened to many discussions of it between radicals, and I am now taking advantage of my position here to present the subject in my own way, rather in the hope that I shall create more discussion than that I shall come near to a settlement of it.

As we all understand very well, the marriage ceremony is only a means by which the State and Church assert their right to interfere with the liberty of the individual in the exercise of one of the most, if not the most, important of those acts to which he is impelled by very reason of being in existence. The one does it on the ground of a duty owed to an imagined being in a mythical sphere; the other interferes on the ground of a duty owed by the individual to a ruling power.

The Church from time to time gives different explanations, varying them to suit the degree of intelligence of the individual addressed. In a general way the excuse of the Church for its different explanations is that God is so considerate that he reveals only so much of the truth as man at any given time is capable of comprehending. The State, on the other hand, is reasonably consistent in contending that it has the right of interference because of its interest in the children which may result from the marriage.

It must be said for the State, however, that it grows more and more lax all the time; and it is altogether likely that if it were not for the matter of the inheritance of property, the State would let all marriage laws fall into abeyance and disuse. But when it comes to that pass, there will probably be no State to make laws or enforce those now in existence.

As matters stand now, however, it must be admitted that the Church has no power to enforce a marriage ceremony between a man and a woman who wish to enter upon either temporary or permanent sex relations, whether with a view to having children or not. The State may have the power in some sections to punish men and women for disregarding the marriage ceremony, but there are few if any States in which, so far as the law is concerned, men and women may not dispense with any ceremony whatever.

Of course there are certain disabilities visited upon the innocent children who are born out of wedlock, but even they may be avoided by the parents with a little care. As yet this has not become a very important question because they are mostly idealists who dispense with priestly or State sanction to their marriages; and idealists are usually such unpractical persons that they accumulate very little to leave to their children.

I speak of marriages without priestly or State sanction advisedly and for the reason that the sociologist usually, if not always in this connection, is concerned only with those unions which are fruitful. Westermarck, in common with other authorities, considers all unions between the sexes as marriages when children result. This is important, since in the study of the family no thought is taken of those unions between men and women which are

not fruitful of children, no matter whether a ceremony has been performed or not.

The justice of such a distinction seems to me apparent and beyond the need of demonstration. Moreover, it is a distinction which we must bear in mind in the consideration of our specific question of marriage ceremony or free union; because, by making it a factor in the discussion, we may differentiate between two distinct phases of the subject of free union. That is to say between the mere association of a man and a woman for convenience or pleasure or improvement, or what not, and with the incident of the child deliberately eliminated, and that same association for whatever other reason but with the child in view besides.

Before going further with that branch of the subject, however, it seems highly desirable to consider briefly some of the forms and effects of marriage, as found in vogue in various parts of the world, since doing so will assist us in understanding better the specific subject before us.

Without trying to be exhaustive I will say that marriage may be said to manifest itself in four distinct forms, with unimportant variations of some of them. Monogamy, polyandry, polygamy, group. Some of these forms are what may be called natural; that is, they have resulted from conditions of life and are not the product of laws made in the interests of any institution such as State or Church. Polyandry, polygamy and group marriages are of this sort, even though laws may be enacted in connection with them to fix them. Monogamy, on the other hand, is not a natural form and, so far as I know, has never actually been practised excepting where, for physical reasons, no other form was possible, as when a man and a woman were isolated on a desert island. I do not mean that individuals have not practiced monogamy, but that no community has ever been known to practice it. This, let me say parenthetically, is not intended to convey the impression that monogamy may not be the form of marriage best suited to the progress of the human animal. I mean to express no opinion as to that, now.

It is not necessary, I take it, for me to do more than state the fact that in communities practicing polyandry,

polygamy or promiscuity, there will almost always be found cases of monogamous union. On the other hand, in those communities professing monogamy there is a profusion of evidence of the practice of all other forms of marriage. Not only is this shown by the laws which have been enacted in all so-called monogamous communities against the practice of the other forms of marriage, but it is a matter of common knowledge and betrays itself constantly. If I may put the case in a phrase, monogamy is a theory, and the other forms of marriage, practice.

In a sense, even the State and Church recognize this, and provide for it with as little sacrifice of the principle underlying their contention of the correctness of monogamy as is possible. True monogamy would demand but one husband or wife in life; and in some parts of the world they are logical enough to kill the wife when the husband dies. I do not recall any logic so pitiless to the surviving husband. In what we call civilized communities, where polygamy or polyandry are illegal and punishable, the death of husband or wife carries permission to the survivor to marry again. The Church sanctions this form of polygamy or polyandry. The State sanctions this form and creates another which it calls divorce, by which a man or a woman may, under given conditions, have several wives or husbands all living. Also the State, recognizing by various statutes the existence of prostitutes, practically concedes promiscuity to men, though without providing any such thing for respectable females.

In polygamy and polyandry the ceremony of marriage is of less importance than in monogamy. Sometimes, indeed, there is no ceremony at all; sometimes it consists in the payment of a price for a bride to her parents, while in some cases all that is given is a stunning blow on the head, to the bride. In monogamy the ceremony is the most important factor, whether priest or magistrate perform it. As I have had occasion to say before, the ceremony of marriage derives its paramount importance from the fact that by it the Church or the State is enabled to keep close to the individual and to control him in the exercise of his most important function. And it may be that the reason why the more astute of priests and

rulers favor monogamy is because it puts an unnatural restraint upon the individual and compels him to the commission of what the Church calls sins, and the State crimes. And it must be borne in mind that if it were not for the creation of sins by the Church, and of crimes by the State, the individual would soon arrive at the recognition of the great truth that he had no need for either institution.

Now, the sex function, being as it is imperious in impulse and the most attractive of all functions in its exercise, is the ideal one for Church and State to meddle with; hence the compulsory monogamy of priest and ruler, since experience has shown that it is impossible in practice. Students have discovered that one of the great cravings of human nature is variety. Sameness seems to pall on whatever sense is afflicted by it, whether it be that of taste or smell, or any other. It seems to be the same in sexual relationship; and I think it was Sir John Lubbock who pointed out that the stronger the legal bond in monogamous marriage, the greater the tendency to secret polygamy. In polygamy there is opportunity for legal variety, but even so there is a tendency to what is called unfaithfulness.

It is for this reason that the so-called and much discussed trial marriage does not seem to be a solution of the difficulty which confronts the believer in legal marriage. While the trial is on, both parties to the arrangement are free and, for that reason, in a frame of mind to be contented; but the instant the legal bond is tied fast, human nature asserts itself and a craving for variety for its own sake is set up. It would seem as if perfect freedom of divorce were a better device than trial marriage; for then marriage would be nothing more than an agreement to remain together as long as the parties to the agreement wished. Of course the factor of the economic situation would then enter in and govern the condition of that one of the married pair who was the economic slave. This is shown clearly in the case of the Japanese in the days before their enlightenment by us. A woman economically dependent feared to be divorced; a woman economically free did not concern herself about it, while the less efficient man who was her husband dreaded it. So with the entire freedom from ceremony in marriage or

divorce the economic situation made for happiness or unhappiness with the Japanese.

Time marriage, or union for a stated period, is another of the devices that has been tried either as a convenience or, less often, as a solution of the problem of marriage; for it must be recognized that it is conceded by conservatives, as it is insisted on by radicals, that marriage is a problem of serious import for humanity. That is why we hear so much of the unhappy home, of divorce and of free union. The difficulty in time marriage as in trial marriage, however, is that usually the factor of the child does not have to be considered; for it is almost inevitable that under the circumstances neither man nor woman would desire to have offspring, which would at once complicate the situation. And yet, it is this very problem of the child which is at the bottom of the marriage problem. If there are to be no children, then practically nobody cares whether a man and woman who live together are legally married or not. Indeed, I think I may go so far as to say that it is even expected of a man who is rich enough to do so that he will legally marry a woman to bear children for him to hand down his wealth to, while he sets up another establishment of the illegal sort, where he may enjoy himself free from the harrowing cares of a family, and especially where he may get away from the nuisance of his slave's company.

I suppose the Thaw case was not needed to make some parts of my statement clear; yet to anyone who has read the details of that case a most illuminating light will appear on this subject of sex relations, marriage and illegal association. As I see it, all of the men and women involved have shown, not the revolt of healthy natures against unnatural restrictions, but rather have held up to us the horror of that diseased condition which follows on a pretended agreement with Church and State, while responding in actuality to morbid sexual desires induced by over-indulgence in every sort of stimulant to passional expression.

I hope it will be seen how all that I have said leads naturally to the discussion of our particular problem of marriage ceremony or free union. It is certain, at any rate, that what I have said, and indeed much more, is properly antecedent to a consideration of the subject.

We know what the marriage ceremony is: either a sacramental or a legal affair which binds a man and a woman for life, mostly. And that is what makes it so hard to bear, so hideous in aspect, so terrible in its results. A man may be a monster in a refined way of expression, degrading his wife by cutting phrase and sneer, ignoring her when she would be recognized, insisting on attention when she would rather be in retirement, invading her wished-for privacy, refusing her in every way the rational expression of herself until in the end she either succumbs and becomes a dumbly suffering slave, as a good wife should be, or breaks the fetters of convention, while still admitting their righteousness; and descends by that path to the gutter of self-condemnation.

On his wife, she being slave in very fact, a man may even put physical suffering, forcing her to the acceptance of what she loathes till it sometimes seems to her that death were joy in comparison. A man may insult his wife with impunity, for it is no other man's business what he does or says to her. He may starve her. He may take her children from her. He may say what she shall or shall not do. Yes, there are some laws to protect her a little bit, but she knows what will happen if she appeals to them; she will be looked at askance by her fellow slaves; she will know that she is being talked about. And her world is so narrow, so confined, that the least step aside from the path of custom brings her up in fear against the walls of her prison; for life is a prison to the wife, and the husband to whom the key was given, threw it away when he had locked the door.

Does it seem an extravagant picture? Yes, to the wife who has subdued herself to her conditions, but not to the woman who is free. Free! ah, yes! that is it. Freedom is the only thing the wife lacks; such a small matter as freedom! And what is this freedom? In what does it consist? Perhaps in the answer to this question lies the solvent of our difficulty. I will not even attempt to answer it now, however.

It may justly be said that the performance of the marriage ceremony over a man and a woman does not always result as terribly as I have pictured. It is even true that very many men and women adjust themselves to each other so well that the friction between them is

very slight, almost unappreciable. Of necessity, men and women being desirous of happiness, will obtain it if possible; and if they have been fairly well educated, or if they have reasonably good natures, they will strive painfully and successfully to overcome the difficulties of the situation so that they may at least be not unhappy. The man will restrain himself when a sharp word leaps to his lips, even though the woman have an unfortunate way of always hitting upon the very expression that irritates him. And the woman will repent her petulance when she sees it has caused pain. And so the two good souls will go on through life, each yielding a little here and there, each modifying this and that characteristic until at last peace comes to them and they can look at each other with soft eyes. They have become so close that the same odors, the same objects, the same words will suggest the same thoughts to both; so that they feel as one person. They no longer need to talk to each other to communicate ideas. They hardly have any ideas that are not in common. Yes, it has been noticed over and over again that man and wife after years together even come to look alike. Why not? It is not strange. They have done the same things together, they have thought the same things together, they have had nothing apart from each other. Odors, sights and sounds suggest the same ideas to them alike.

And that consummation is the beautiful flower blooming on the stem of a perfect and complete monogamous marriage. Do you like it? Is it something to rejoice in? Two individuals lost and an example left! Do you know that to me this beautiful picture of a perfect wedded life is worse than the other of the woman driven to desperation by a brutal tyrant. To me the struggle for liberty is always noble and inspiring, even when unconsciousness of the nature of the struggle is the unhappy fate of the poor wretch; while contentment in the most idyllic slavery is shocking and painful to contemplate. There is hope for the cause of freedom so long as the slave is driven to revolt, no matter what his own view of slavery and freedom may be. He will find himself on the right side some time, and very anger will put him in agreement with the foes of slavery. Reflection on freedom may follow, and then life will begin. It is better to be unhappy

in freedom than contented in slavery. Let us hope that more men will be brutal tyrants as husbands. A kind master is a foe to freedom.

But is it really the marriage ceremony that is the cause of all this trouble and misery? True, the marriage ceremony is a device of the priest and the ruler, intended to keep men and women in dependence. But also there is a divine commandment against lying. Most of us believe it is a divine commandment and that God will punish the liar with hell fire. Nevertheless men and women of approved piety, yes, even priests, lie every day and often. There is a divine commandment against stealing and, like the sacrament of marriage, it is reinforced by the laws of man, yet men steal every day and are applauded for doing it successfully; applauded, if imitation be applause. We read every day of oil men and railroad men and sugar men and others who have lied and stolen and are in places of power because of it. And have we not the assurance of President Roosevelt that all men but himself are liars? Why is it that these men, so notoriously wicked, are not put in prison or ostracized? Is it not because our attitude toward the things they have done is not one of condemnation?

On the other hand, why is it that I wear a hat when I go about the city? I dislike a hat, and I don't wear one when I am in the country. Is it not because the attitude of the people of the city is one of condemnation toward a man who does not wear a hat? That it is silly of me to care and silly of them to have that attitude is nothing. I do care because I am happier when I am not attracting too much attention. I admit it is weak of me, but it is true that I care. I argue with myself that the people are very foolish to feel as they do, but since they do, I will humor them in this, in order that I may save my energies for something more important to me. So I conform to prejudice in many things, in order that I may hold out the more successfully in the matters that seem to me of importance. I do not believe in the use of force and I think law foolish; but when a policeman tells me to go with him, I go, and when I am arraigned in court I make use of the law to get myself free.

Perhaps it is not the marriage ceremony that does the mischief, but rather the attitude of the man and the

woman toward it. If they believe it essential to purity —it and all the slavery it involves—then it seems to me it is their attitude rather than the ceremony that is at fault so far as they are concerned. It is true that as a symbol of authority and of slavery in one of its worst forms, the marriage ceremony is objectionable to me; but is it not equally true that if all men and women believed it as foolish and as objectionable as I do, it would cease to have any compelling force? What if I and the woman both agree that the ceremony is to us no more than an outworn rite, perfectly hollow and meaningless? What if we say to each other that for greater freedom from some real evil we will go through the silly form, mutually agreed to accord each other entire freedom notwithstanding? What if it is clear to me and the woman that we can better work against the continuance of the institution from within it than if handicapped by the accusation from others that we hate it because we are outcasts?

I do not say that these considerations are of sufficient force to justify submission to the ceremony if I am of the opinion that as a matter of principle I should not submit. But is there a great principle involved? And what is the principle? Do you object to the marriage ceremony because it is a recognition of the slavery of woman? Then I would answer that one free woman in wedlock is a noble and a splendid object lesson; and that the evidence is most valuable that no institution can stand against one's own consciousness of freedom. The ceremony has nothing to do with my freedom or the woman's. We alone can say, each for himself, that we will be free.

If the ceremony necessarily operated to enslave, it would not be possible to treat it as a matter of little importance. But the ceremony does not so operate. If I and the woman are already enslaved, the ceremony represents our idea. If we are free, the ceremony is no more than if we had stood in the East wind. As I see it, the marriage ceremony is foolish and useless to accomplish the purpose for which it was devised; you cannot characterize it too harshly to suit me. And yet, I contend that the essential thing is freedom. If the ceremony mean slavery for you, then it is you who are at fault. If you can wed as you would put on the hat you despise, retain-

ing your liberty unimpaired, then the ceremony is only a foolish rite to be rid of, but not to make a bugaboo of.

All of this must have the seeming of a plea for the ceremony. No, it is only a preface to what I have to say on the subject of the free union. What is a free union? Is it an association of a man and a woman who despise the legal or sacramental form of marriage, and who therefore come together in perfect freedom? A free union! Can one be free in a union? I can conceive of two free persons associating together, but the word and the clear meaning of union trouble me as much as the old marriage idea. Still, if the man and the woman are free in the union, then it does not matter what word is used. But I still insist that freedom is the thing, I don't care whether it is a union or a marriage.

Does the woman take your name, and do you go together to occupy the same house, the same room, maybe? And you say you are free? You pretend to believe she is free? Perhaps you are very good to her and give her money so that she need not work. Perhaps she takes care of your house for you in return for what you do for her. Perhaps she loves you so much that she wants to know why you did not get home at the usual time after your work. Perhaps she does you the honor to be jealous of you. Perhaps the only difference between you and Mr. and Mrs. Conservative is that they were so narrow that they had a priest make them man and wife, while you were so broad that you enslaved yourselves.

Would you of the free union frankly practice polygamy? Or do you believe in monogamy? And if you do believe in monogamy, do you believe in it for yourself alone, or for her also? It is important to know these things, for it may very well be that the free union is only a euphemism for slavery. Anyhow it must be clear that if two believers in slavery enter into a free union, they will not thereby become free.

Again, it is well to know whether or not this free union was entered into with the intention of having children. If not, and there happen to be no children, then you have no standing in this court. This is not saying that there is any obligation resting on you to bring children into the world, but at least you are incurring none of the risk

which the parents of illegitimate children run, and it is not for you to point to yourselves.

Is it not a fact well enough known to all who have had the opportunity to observe, that there are persons united in holy wedlock who are yet free, while there are those joined in a free union who are unfree? It would seem to me that the free union and the conventional marriage are the same thing under slightly different aspects. In the nature of things it is inevitable that when a man and a woman come together under circumstances that involve a loss of individuality for one or both, they cannot be free no matter what their theories may be on entering into this union.

It is very difficult to be free; mainly because it is difficult for us to conceive freedom. There are those who fancy they win freedom by exchanging a king for a republic; whereas it is merely going from one sort of slavery to another. And the republic may even be worse than the kingdom. These are only names for different sorts of government. You are free only when you are free. Saying you are free does not make you so. To cry "down with the king, but long live the republic," only shows that you have put off the day of your freedom a little longer, because you are now deceiving yourself. I sometimes think the Russians are far nearer to freedom than we, for many of them have the true conception of it.

All of this applies to the marriage and the free union, as I understand the case. The state which is entered into is the same in both instances. It is a union. I can understand free motherhood, but not free union.

I am not saying that I would not have a man and a woman enter into a free and beautiful companionship, but I am prepared to say that I do not think the paternity of a child is anybody's business—that is, anybody's but the mother's. And I do think it is entirely her business. It seems to me that we are all victims of a morbid and utterly unhealthy sexuality. It is the sex relations of other persons that we are concerned about. When a man and a woman are married or enter into a free union, what is it that first and instantly enters our minds? Is it not the one thing that is so absolutely not our business that there has never been made one good excuse for our concerning ourselves with it?

As I have said, I do not think it matters much whether one enters into a conventional marriage or an unconventional one under the name of free union, so that one preserve his freedom; but I am willig to go on record as saying that any calling of public attention to sex union is either a concession to prurient curiosty or the slavish following of a custom. I know a young woman who is a mother without being a wife. No one knows who the father of the child is. She says it is no one's affair. She lives alone with her child, having given her body into the keeping of neither husband nor lover, prepared to maintain full control of herself and to say when, if ever, she will become a mother again. That young woman I honor and applaud.

So my conclusion is that it is difficult, if not impossible, to be free in either marriage or free union, and that, therefore, I think there should be found a better way than either; for to me freedom is the paramount consideration. That is to say I want to be myself, and just as passionately I want the woman I love to be herself. One can be himself only in freedom.

And as the last word, now, I want to say and to ask you to believe that I mean all that is implied in the words: a woman can be a mother in freedom; she cannot be a wife in freedom.

OUR PROPAGANDA

My tour through the State of New York was as successful as could be expected at the present time of industrial misery, when thousands of people are out of work.

The meetings at Utica, a Catholic city and one of the most backward in the State, were very poorly attended; still, some good was accomplished, inasmuch as the newspapers brought good reports. Especially was this true with regard to my paper on "What Anarchism Really Stands For." The Utica *Daily Press* published an almost stenographic report of the greater part of the lecture.

At Syracuse the meetings were well attended, in spite of a terrific snowstorm. As the comrades were anxious to hear an oral report of the Amsterdam Congress, a group meeting was decided upon after my second lecture, and all Anarchists and their sympathizers were invited to attend. About thirty people gathered at a comrade's house. While I was making my report, a knock was heard at the door and three brutish-looking men entered. They proved to be two detectives and a reporter, who came to break up the "secret" session of the Anarchists. They were informed that they had no legal right (not to speak of decency, which has never been characteristic of detectives) to enter a private residence so late at night, and that they would have to leave at once. After threatening to arrest me and freely using coarse language, they backed out. This is another example of our glorious freedom, where every detective assumes the right to invade and annoy people in their own homes.

The comrades all expressed themselves in favor of the International, contributing to the latter five dollars and eighty cents.

Rochester, my "native" city, turned out very good audiences, especially to the lectures on "The Revolutionary Spirit in the Modern Drama" and "Woman Under Anarchism." It is not so very long ago that an Anarchist could not be found in Rochester with a searchlight. Now a large group of young people is doing active work, and many Anarchists, though not affiliated with the group, are spreading our ideas in an effective manner.

At Albany, the centre of political corruption and graft, two good meetings and a social were held. At the latter five dollars were collected for the International.

Schenectady gave the largest American audience and a very enthusiastic one at that. I spoke on "Syndicalism —a New Phase in the Labor Movement," which was listened to with great interest and appreciation. The success of the Schenectady meeting was entirely due to the efforts of one man, comrade Schneider, who worked persistently and faithfully, in spite of many discouragements and obstacles. An obscure little body, The Workers' Circle of Schenectady, felt called upon to notify the press and the city fathers that "it had nothing to do with the Emma Goldman meetings." No wonder that wage slavery continues to exist, when the workers are such lickspittles.

After the meeting the Social Educational Club was organized, which will continue the work of Anarchist propaganda.

That the comrades of the State of New York mean to continue the work systematically is best proved by their decision to arrange a series of meetings for our friend John R. Coryell, who is to lecture in Syracuse February 23rd; in Rochester on the 24th and 25th; in Buffalo on the 26th, and in Schenectady on the 27th.

* * *

I was booked to speak in Philadelphia January 24th and 25th. But a severe cold prevented my going. Comrade Alexander Berkman went in my stead and addressed a large audience.

Though still indisposed, I went to Baltimore January 26th, where I spoke before the largest audience I have had in the East for some time. More than a thousand persons packed the hall, while hundreds had to be turned away. The audience as well as the comrades were very kind and forbearing with me, as my throat was bad and my speech still worse.

Monday, January 26th, I lectured in Pittsburg, the city where thousands of working people are yearly sacrificed to the Moloch of capitalism, the worst grinding mill being the Westinghouse. In this city it was also a solitary comrade, H. Kraemer, who arranged my meet-

ing single handed and at his own expense, and it was very successful indeed.

I shall start my tramp westward via Canada, my schedule being as follows:

Montreal, February 14th and 15th, at San Joseph's Hall, 182 Catherine St. (Lecture in German.)

Montreal, February 16th, at the Labor Temple, 123 San Dominic St. (English lecture.)

Toronto, February 17th, at 214 Adelaide St. (English.)

Toronto, February 18th, at the same hall. (German.)

London, February 19th and 20th, at Cullis Hall, 259 Wellington St. (Both lectures in English.)

Cleveland, February 21st and 22nd, at 5217 Woodland Ave. (German lectures.)

Cleveland, February 23rd, at Pythian Temple, cor. Prospect Ave. and Huron Rd. (English lecture.)

Toledo, February 24th, 25th and 26th.

St. Louis, February 28th, 29th and March 1st.

Springfield, March 2nd and 3rd.

Chicago, March 5th till 19th.

Milwaukee, Minneapolis, New Ulm and Winnipeg will keep me engaged till the 6th of April. After that I shall go to Omaha, Denver and the Coast.

Much as I dislike to repeat that I expect the proceeds of my lectures to be devoted to MOTHER EARTH, I must do so to avoid misunderstanding, since one has already occurred with a certain group. I tour for MOTHER EARTH exclusively. If some important matter should arise which will require financial aid, I expect the comrades to consult with me; otherwise I desire the proceeds to go to MOTHER EARTH, which cannot exist without it.

EMMA GOLDMAN.

THE ANARCHIST FEDERATION OF NFW YORK

MONTHLY REPORT.

COMRADES:

The mass meeting for the unemployed, organized by the Federation, has proven very successful. A series of such meetings are now in preparation, with the object of carrying on a systematic and effective propaganda.

The Federation has issued 25,000 leaflets, explaining in a popular manner the causes of the crisis and the remedy. The leaflets have been sent for free distribution all over the country. We are daily receiving requests for more of our leaflets, and we are preparing to meet the supply. But we should like to call the attention of comrades and groups that the work of the Federation requires considerable funds. All those interested in the spread of revolutionary Anarchism will greatly aid our work by giving us both their moral and financial support.

Besides the leaflets we are also publishing an educational pamphlet, in Jewish and English, on the subject of the crisis. The pamphlets will be ready by the time this report reaches our comrades. Those wishing a consignment of the pamphlets are requested to notify us at once. We shall be able to supply the pamphlets at $2 per hundred. The English pamphlet will contain 8 pages, while the Jewish will consist of 16.

The Federation has decided to issue Subscription Lists, in order to raise a fund for systematic propaganda on a large scale. Those wishing to assist in our work and desiring Lists, should notify the treasurer.

Besides a number of individual comrades, the following groups have joined the Federation: Mother Earth, Progressive Library, Weckruf, Licht für Frauen, Freier Entwicklungs-Verein, Group Freiheit, Anarchistisches Lese-Zimmer, all of New York. Further have joined: Group Arbeiter Freund, Montreal; Group Freiheit, Paterson, and comrades of Atlantic City.

The Federation, realizing the importance of Anarchist propaganda and enthusiastic in the cause, is entering upon the good work with courage, energy, and hope.

Fraternally,

The Anarchist Federation of New York.

P. S.—All communications to the Federation are to be addressed to the Secretary, J. O. Behr, 552 Fox St., New York. Money to be sent to the Treasurer, Alexander Berkman, 210 E. 13th St., New York.

CHICAGO FEDERATION REPORT

The International Federation of Chicago was organized January 22nd, 1908. Twenty-five comrades, representing three groups, were present. Comrade Theodore Appel was selected to act as Secretary of the Federation. It was decided to issue a call to all Anarchists, through the medium of the Anarchist press of the country.

All questions of import have been postponed till the next meeting, which is to take place February 5th, in the Edelstadt Club Rooms, Union and West Twelfth Streets.

THEODORE APPEL.

LECTURES.

Comrade Alexander Berkman will lecture Wednesday, February 12th, 8 P. M., at American Star Hall, Pitkin Avenue and Christopher Street, Brooklyn. Subject: "What do the Anarchists want?"

CONCERNING C. L. JAMES'S VINDICATION OF ANARCHISM

Comrades:

Over a year ago we appealed to you concerning the publication of a book by C. L. James, in our opinion a very valuable one for the movement. We asked you for contributions towards its publication. In response to our appeal we received $19, which have remained in Miss Notkin's hands awaiting further disposal. Directly after the publication of our appeal, the wretched attack of the State upon our New York comrades diverted all efforts to the fighting of that battle, and we felt that it would be both useless and unjustifiable to ask the comrades to do more at that time. A succession of untoward circumstances caused us to postpone the renewal of the appeal till now. Even now we realize that the slack time is not an opportune one for again urging the matter upon you; but we feel that unless some effort is made to go on with the work, the money already sent should be returned to the senders. Therefore we once more ask that all who are interested in seeing this work appear, shall communicate with Miss N. Notkin, 2630 E. Lehigh Ave., Philadelphia, Pa., without delay.

In our opinion, the "Vindication" fills a decided need in the literature of Anarchism, and it will be a great pity if lack of means (which is another way of saying lack of interest and appreciation) shall compel us to give up the plan. We should be glad if the various groups would take up the matter, and write to Miss Notkin at once.

For the Philadelphia comrades,

Voltairine De Cleyre,
George Brown,
Natasha Notkin.

MOTHER EARTH SUSTAINING FUND

RECEIPTS.

Juan U. Cepero, New York	$ 25
Proceeds from E. G. lectures at:	
Group Weckruf, New York	10.00
Albany, New York	19.00
Schenectady, New York	15.58
Rochester, New York	30.00
Syracuse, New York	8.00
Baltimore, Md	58.00
Pittsburg, Pa	36.00
A. B. lecture at Philadelphia, Pa	10.00
A. B. lecture at Paterson, N. J.	4.30
Contribution by Winnipeg Group, Winnipeg, Can.	15.00
Henry Kopczinski, Milwaukee, Wis	1.00
Leo Kopczinski, Milwaukee, Wis	1.00
	$208.13

EXPENDITURES.

Deficit, as per January account	$128.54
E. G. expenses, N. Y. State tour	20.00
E. G. expenses, trip to Baltimore and Pittsburg	27.00
Deficit, January M. E.	112.26
Publishing "Modern Science and Anarchism"	155.00
	$442.80
Deficit	$234.67

THE RIDE INTO THE DESERT

By SADAKICHI HARTMANN.

THE trail led straight into the desert. On either side, save some dark clumps of green wood and sage brush and a few lonely hills studded with scrub cedars, there was naught but the level monotony of the plain, a naked tractless waste, a silent shoreless sea of sand.

It was a clear moonlight night. The moon, resembling a big silver wafer high in the heavens, seemed to have drowned the light of the stars and crept with a vague grey shimmer over the surface of the earth. Over it the dome of night rose like the huge cover over a dish, welling in the mystic world of the desert—calm and vast as the realm of death—from the rest of life.

On the vague and desolate path a lonesome horseman, followed by two pack mules with tinkling bells, made his way. He was wrapped in a huge cloak, a broad felt hat shaded his sallow face. His eyes gazed straight ahead, and an expression of grim determination trembled in the lines of his mouth.

His task was a proud and solitary one. He was riding away from civilization—into the desert, to escape the torturing memories of his past. He was tired of the life of large cities, sad and empty as the burning course over the trackless plain and shadowless land that lay before him. Such is life, sere and parched as the desert's floor. Those who are happy do not realize their happiness. Man, earth-soiled and toil-worn, is blind until misfortune teaches him to see. He had learnt to see that life is unjust to all and full of lies. The whole globe of ours is but a colossal lie revolving around itself. Loyalty, enthusiasm, honesty, benevolence, friendship were lies, and what is called love is the biggest of them all. Why had he not been able to continue to believe in all those lies, and to remain blind like the rest. He surely had a right to be blind for he had believed in everything man can believe.

Thus he had come to leave all he had known, to search for some calm of life in the vast stretches of the dead landscape. In the wilderness, among the lonely

sunhot hills, among wild beasts and savage tribes he hoped to find some allay and appeasement for all that he had lost.

How terribly lonesome it was out here. No call of a bird, no insect chirp, no sound of nature save the occasional rustle of dead weeds under the hoofs of his horse. He would not have been astonished if he had found the path strewn with huge skulls and whitening bones of buffalos, or of some one, lonesome like himself, who had perished on this seat of desolation. He heard a low murmuring noise. Hastily he cocked his rifle with a sharp click, while a sudden fear lit at his heart. There was nothing to disturb him. A few minutes later he had reached a thin sheet of rapid turbid water, only a few feet wide and scarcely two feet deep. Although his water flasks were well filled, he dismounted for a cooling draught. He formed the rim of his hat into a cup and dipped it into the stream, but the water was so charged with sand that it grated on his teeth in drinking.

Slowly he pursued his ride. One solitary white cloud drifted along the sapphire wall of the sky, a strange companion on his nocturnal ride. Where was she drifting too! On what shore would she be stranded! Was her journey aimless like his. Alas, to be as unconcerned, as roving free, heeding neither time nor space, as that fair white pilgrim of the sky!

Suddenly an unlooked-for sight greeted his eyes. In the distance, like some mirage fantasy, lay a settlement, white buildings surrounded by aisles of trees. Were they spectres like the rising dust whirls that occasionally rose in the haze of the desert? For hours he had seen no human abode; he had grown used to the scenes of loneliness without any apparent breath of actuality, but now he recalled a remark made to him at the inn he had left early in the morning, that he would pass the last rancho late in the evening.

The house, a weird whitewashed structure, looked like the ghostlike ruin of some human habitation that sheltered naught but flattering shadows and pale robed phantoms. The solitary horseman intended to gallop past it. He did not care to be reminded of any sign of civilization. Yet as he approached the house,

he suddenly drew the reins and halted. The lighted windows were wide open. In the garden some tall flowers of vague tarnished tints rose motionless into the grayness of the night. All nature seemed lifeless save the foliage of a row of trees which quivered in the moonlight. With hands resting on his rifle, as if lost in some gleaming memory, he stared at the lighted window and at the trees, and he imagined to see the leaves like a rippling stream flow from their branches and to hear the vague murmur of their wavelike motion.

At that moment the sound of a piano was heard from the house, and a woman's voice started a song, vain melancholy sounds and words that were carried in broken fragments to the ghostlike listener outside:

"What holds us fast to this weary life
—As sorrows come and go
Like winds of death that o'er deserts blow
To this bitter strife, so sad and grey
Like a sunless day
In the fall of the year.
When leaves are falling and life is sere.

The song ceased. The man wrapped in his cloak breathed deep. With one hand on the back of his saddle he lifted himself in the stirrups, as if he were waiting for more.

Then the music began anew. The woman's voice seemed to float, surge and billow o'er the boundless waste and to fill with melodies of ebbing joys the vastness of space. How it gripped at his heart. All the feelings that he deemed long buried and forgotten welled up to the surface of his mind, shifting hither and thither in strange agitation not unlike the spinning swirls of dust that rise from the sand of the desert. He shivered and shrunk together, as in fear of those memories which no man from the large cities can resist. He raised one arm and buried his face in it.

He knew he could not go any farther. He was not born for the hermit life among the sunhot hills under domes of turqouise blue. He lifted his tear-dimmed face into the moonlight night—suddenly turned his

horse, pressed his spurs into its flanks and galloped back, like a madman pursued by the furies of desolation, back the road whence he came, back to civilization.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

FRANCE.

The government recently suffered two severe defeats. The attempt to convict the *Voix du Peuple,* official organ of the Confédération Générale du Travail, has completely failed. Comrade Grandjouan, who was indicted for inciting class hatred by his illustrations, was acquitted. On a similar charge comrade Libertad, editor of *L'Anarchie* was also found not guilty.

The Shylock government, however, had to have its pound of flesh. The law got into its clutches Vinaud, responsible editor of *Voix du Peuple,* condemning him to fifteen days' imprisonment and one thousand francs' fine.

* * *

The syndicalists have added a new weekly to their already considerable number of publications; the new organ is *L'Action Directe,* Paris, 122 Quai Jemmapes. Well-known literary men are among the contributors of the new paper.

AUSTRIA.

Seventeen dock laborers were discharged at the port of Triest on the accusation of being Anarchist agitators. A General Strike was the result, the ship companies being finally forced to yield by reinstating the discharged comrades.

* * *

Andriani, editor of the Triest Anarchist publication *Germinal,* and the printer of the paper have been arrested in connection with the General Strike.

A new Anarchist fortnightly, *Wohlstand für Alle*, has recently been issued in Vienna. The address is: XII Fockeystrasse, 27. That the new fighter is doing well is best proven by the fact that it has already come in conflict with the authorities, who confiscated several issues.

GERMANY.

The régime of the German Kaiser has added another victim to its already long list. Comrade Carl Kielmeyer, editor of *Der Freie Arbeiter,* has been sent to prison for a year, on the following charges: Insulting the non-commissioned officers, ridiculing the government, and inciting the military to insubordination.

* * *

A Russian revolutionist has been arrested in Münich, while attempting to exchange bank notes which had been expropriated by the revolutionists in Tiflis.

In connection with this affair two other Russian revolutionists were arrested in Paris, at the request of Batyushka.

PORTUGAL.

The comrades who were thrown into prison after the explosion in Rue de Santo Antonio have all been liberated, for lack of evidence, except the three wounded ones. But after the second explosion in Rue du Carriâs the freed Anarchists were again arrested.

SPAIN.

A revolutionary syndicalist organization has been formed in Barcelona, consisting of fifty-four labor unions of that city. The new body plans to spread its branches all over the country, to embrace every workingman in the kingdom. The official organ of the Spanish syndicalists is *Solidaridad Obrera.*

ROUMANIA.

The Liberal Ministry is daily growing more severe in its persecution of the young labor movement. The Expulsion Law, a most dangerous weapon, is being exercised freely. Not only aliens, but natives entitled to political rights, are being expelled. The most striking

example of governmental arbitrariness is shown in the cases of comrades Dr. G. Rakovsky, Atanasoff, Moseu, and G. Covaei. All four are Roumanian subjects, the latter the son of an officer who died in the War of Liberation, in 1877. Already one thousand men have been expelled and many more are added daily.

Of course, the majority of these victims are Jews; the latter are considered aliens by the government, though they are natives, paying taxes and serving in the army. Without the slightest excuse Jews can be expelled within twenty-four hours.

It will interest our readers to know that the outrageous Expulsion Law had been enacted at the request of the Russian government. After the execution of Alexander II., in 1881, the Roumanian government took precautions to get rid of the Russian revolutionists who had escaped to Roumania and from there smuggled revolutionary literature into Russia. The Liberal Ministry, with Ivan Bratianu at its head, succeeded in 1881 to enact this shameful and inhuman Expulsion Law. The early Socialists fought against the law with all their power. But now we are witnessing the tragi-comic spectacle of the one-time Socialists clamoring for the strict enforcement of the Expulsion Law. The present Liberal Ministry and the House count among their most important members the leaders of the early Socialist movement.

INDIA.

While the trade unions of America and Canada were protesting against the immigration of Indian workingmen, the native railroad employees of this country were carrying on a great battle for the improvement of their condition, and have now brought their strike to an end by gaining important concessions from the railroad companies.

* * *

The new act for the "prevention of seditious meetings" in India is, perhaps, the most drastic ever imposed by a government on any people. It is questionable whether any written law in Russia can compare with the Indian Sedition Act that is now enforced with the approval of John Morley, British "liberal," scholar, and "humanita-

rian." The act provides that no meeting can be held to discuss questions of peculiar interests to the people of India and prohibits circulation of printed matter bearing on these questions. A meeting of more than twenty persons is considered a public meeting. Permissions for meetings must be secured from the superintendent of police. Police officers are sent to such meetings to report proceedings, and meetings may be dispersed on the order of the police commissioner. Any person concerned in the promotion of meetings where notice is not given or permission obtained, is subject to imprisonment or fine, or both. Any meeting which has been prohibited is deemed an unlawful assembly and subject to proceedings under the criminal code, and arrests may be made without warrant at any time. All of these provisions apply to meetings which in the judgment of the authorities are "likely" to create disturbance. The sweet will of police officials will determine that.

The brutality and despotism of the authorities are serving to awaken the people from their apathy and rouse them to rebellion.

TURKEY.

After two and a half years' incarceration the Belgian Anarchist Joris has been set free. Joris had been condemned to death on the charge of conspiracy against the life of the Sultan, on the occasion of the bomb explosion at Constantinople, in May, 1905. Thanks to a vigorous campaign on the part of the Belgian Anarchists, which eventually spread all over Europe, Joris was rescued from the clutches of the Turkish government. He is now in Belgium.

CHILE.

The butchery of the strikers in the saltpeter regions has disclosed a terrible state of affairs prevalent there.

No less than two hundred and fifty workingmen were killed by rapid-fire guns. The victims, who were half-breeds, were kept in abject slavery and subjected to the most inhuman treatment and hardships. This, together with the murderous conditions of the mines, drove the workmen to strike for better pay and treatment.

The government, however, which derives its main revenue from the exorbitant tariff on saltpeter, turned a deaf ear to the strikers' demands. Instead, it ordered the soldiers to drive the men back to work, which resulted in the bloody bath of two hundred and fifty victims.

* * *

In the Social Democratic daily, *La Vanguardia,* of Buenos Ayres, Argentine, we read a gratifying correspondence from Chile, telling of the tremendous inroads of the anti-militaristic idea into the minds of the people. The anti-militarist propaganda, started here by workingmen in 1901 and timidly taken up by a few weekly papers, has gradually grown into a strong movement. Among many others, a young Chilean nobleman, Gustavo Ross Santa Maria, has recently refused to do service, fighting his case through all legal and constitutional instances. Though condemned by all the courts, the judges did not dare to enforce the sentence. Labor uses this fact for splendid propaganda for equal laws for rich and poor. Last year 30 per cent., and this year 97 per cent. of the conscripts refused to show up. The government is at its wits' end.

* * *

The Comrades of Conception have founded an institution which promises to transfer the pedagogic ideas of Ferrer in Spain, and Molinari in Italy, upon the soil of Chile. Under the name "Ciencia y Vida" they have established the nucleus of a people's university, embracing a sociological library and Sunday lectures on economy and sociology. Papers, reviews and books are solicited, to be addressed as follows: Pedro Lontt, Casilla 285, Concepcion, Chile.

* * *

A splendidly conducted railroad strike, extending over the whole country and crippling traffic and commerce, has brought victory to the men, the government arbitrating, after failing to overawe labor by a display of soldiery. The government cannot trust its own soldiers, in the face of the tremendous effects of anti-militaristic propaganda, which—according to official admission—necessitates the disarmament of the warships, since

enough recruits have not come to the front at the last conscription to man them.

ARGENTINE.

The government is executing against foreign Anarchists the special law enacted since the last strike. Roberto d'Angio and Mariano Frocat, editors of the daily revolutionary labor paper *La Protesta,* have been expelled from the country together with six other comrades. The latter were very active syndicalists, who also inaugurated the rent strikes, which have extended all over the country.

BRAZIL.

Our correspondent from Sao Paulo reports a strong eight-hour-day movement and splendid direct action victories of many trades in Sao Paulo, Campinas, Santos, Ribeirao-Preto. Sao Roque, Iparanguinha, and Pilar. These successes have been obtained in the face of employers' associations, aided by government and the brutal police, and in spite of persecution and arrests. With the eight-hour-day many other improvements have been gained by some of the trades, as, for instance, the abolishment of piece work, regular pay day, and—in some instances—higher wages.

BOLIVIA.

The government has tried to kill in its incipiency the movement towards organization of awakening labor. The latter has been effectively aided by the efforts of the weekly *La Aurora Social,* which is the organ of the Federacion de Trabajadores. The editors, Federico Martinez, a citizen of Argentine, and Mateo Skarnie, a native of Austria, have been arrested and deported to Chile. But individuals do not matter in the onward march of awakening labor.

A 393

BOOKS RECEIVED

ERNEST HOWARD CROSBY. Leonard D. Abbott. The Ariel Press, Westwood, Mass.

ON MORAL SENTIMENTALIZING. Theodore Schroeder. Pacific Medical Journal.

LOVE AND PASSION. John Russell Coryell. The Corwill Publishing Co., 24 E. 21st Street, New York.

THE RENT STRIKE. John Russell Coryell. The Corwill Publishing Co., New York.

LA CASERMA . . . SCUOLA DELLA NAZIONE. Leda Rafanelli, Paterson, N. J.

EL PROBLEMA DE POBLACION. Sebastián Faure. Salud y Fuerza, Barcelona.

WE have just issued one of the best works of

PETER KROPOTKIN

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM

The book, though scientific, is written in a popular style. Nobody who wishes to be well grounded in the philosophy of Anarchism can afford to miss this book

PRICE, 25 CENTS

Mother Earth Publishing Association

210 East 13th Street, New York

Trade Unionism and Anarchism

By JAY FOX

is a pamphlet specially written to enlighten the conservative unionist as to the relation of Anarchism to the question of labor. An excellent brochure for propaganda in the unions

PRICE, 5 CENTS

TO BE HAD THROUGH

MOTHER EARTH or

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE LEAGUE, CHICAGO

THE WIDE WAY

A new magazine of progress, edited by JOHN RUSSELL CORYELL, author of "A WEIRD AND WONDERFUL STORY OF ANOTHER WORLD," which created such a profound sensation when published in *Physical Culture.*

MARGARET GRANT, author of "A CHILD OF LOVE," writes exclusively for THE WIDE WAY. Read her greatest story, now running in this magazine,

"AN IMMORAL MAID."

Send ten cents for sample copy **One dollar a year**

CORWILL PUBLISHING COMPANY

24 EAST 21st STREET - - - NEW YORK CITY

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EUGENICS

The Pioneer Magazine in the English Language Devoted to Prenatal Culture and the Right of Every Child to Be Well Born.

It Treats of Sexual Science

In a Sane, Intelligent, and inoffensive manner. It points out the vital necessity for a broader knowledge of Sexual Hygiene. Hence it opposes any attempt to restrict Instruction in Sexual Science.

Reproduction of the Human Race

Is discussed by men and women who have made a special study of the Sexual Relations, and who realize that quality is of more importance than Numbers.

It Insists on the Freedom of Men and Women

From Sexual Slavery. It insists on the Right of Every Woman to the Control of Her Own Person. It insists that Woman alone shall be the one to decide When and Under What Conditions she will bring a New Human Being into Existence.

Fifteen cents a copy; $1.50 a year. Order of Newsdealer or of Publisher,

M. HARMAN, Chicago, Ill.

SPECIAL OFFERS: Send 25 cents for a three months' trial subscription and a copy of "Institutional Marriage," a lecture by the editor. **EUGENICS AND MOTHER EARTH ONE YEAR FOR $1.75.**

THE FOLLOWING PLAYS OF

HENRIK IBSEN

TO BE HAD THROUGH *MOTHER EARTH*

A Doll's House	25c
The Pillars of Society	25c
Ghosts	25c
Rosmersholm	25c
The Lady from the Sea	25c
An Enemy of Society	25c
The Wild Duck	25c
The Young Men's League	25c
Hedda Gabler	50c
The Master Builder	50c

Books to be had through MOTHER EARTH

210 E. 13th ST., NEW YORK.

Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal. New Edition, 1907. By Peter Kropotkin..... **5c.**

Fields, Factories, and Workshops. By Peter Kropotkin ..... **50c.**

Memoirs of a Revolutionist. By Peter Kropotkin. Reduced to..... **$1.60**

Ideals of Russian Literature. By Peter Kropotkin.. **$2.00**

The State: Its Rôle in History. By Peter Kropotkin..... **10c.**

The Wage System. By Peter Kropotkin..... **5c.**

Anarchism Communism: Its Basis and Principles. By Peter Kropotkin..... **5c.**

An Appeal to the Young. By Peter Kropotkin..... **5c.**

Law and Authority. An Anarchist Essay. By Peter Kropotkin ..... **10c.**

War. By Peter Kropotkin.....**5c.**

Origin of Anarchism. By C. L. James..... **5c.**

History of the French Revolution. (An excellent work for students. It begins with a sketch of history of the earliest times; the decline of the ancient empires, the rise of the French monarchy, and traces the causes which made the Revolution inevitable. The philosophic conclusion is unsurpassed, and the position taken, laying a foundation for the philosophy of freedom, is bound to attract the attention of thinkers.) By C. L. James.....**$1.00**

4-393